

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

As filed, the application included claims 1-41. No claims have been amended, canceled or added. Hence, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-41 stand pending for examination.

Claims 1-14 and 29-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter.

Claims 1, 7-15, 18, 19, 21-34 and 38-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0032687 to Huff (“Huff”).

Claims 2 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huff in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 4,501,559 to Griswold et al. (“Griswold”).

Claims 3-6, 17, 20, 35 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huff in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,429 to Kane et al. (“Kane”).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101. All claims are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as detailed in the guidelines provided at, for example, MPEP § 2106.01. Specifically, claims 1 and 29 recite interactions with a host computer and/or a user computer and/or storing information. Hence, the claims are directed to statutory subject matter. Moreover, one or more claims that depend from claims 1 or 29 include elements that provide additional statutory subject matter. Hence, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are believed to be improper.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because Huff does not teach each and every claim element, either expressly or inherently, as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Specifically, for example, claim 1 recites “comparing individual node records and identifying pairs of records having similar data; for each identified pair of individual node records, comparing related individual node records and deciding based on predetermined criteria whether the identified pair of individual node records represent the same person; [and] consolidating the information from a plurality of records determined to represent the same person into a single person record.” The Office Action appears to suggest that Huff’s statement “online accumulation and comparison of data from multiple sources with the goal of accurate linking to overcome duplication” anticipates these elements. This is unfounded and amounts to an improper rejection. Moreover, the “predetermined criteria” of ¶[0164] is not used to decide whether records represent the same person. Hence, claim 1 is believed to be allowable, at least for the foregoing reasons.

Claim 15 includes elements similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 and is believed to be allowable, at least for the foregoing reasons.

Claim 39 recites “perform a relationship analysis to infer relationships among persona records using the assertions of the persona records; if a relationship is inferred, assign at least one relationship type to the relationship between the records.” The Office Action appears to suggest that Huff’s teachings at ¶[0172] anticipate these elements. At that location, however, Huff does not teach a relationship analysis to infer relationships. Hence, claim 39 is believed to be allowable, at least for this reason.

Claim 29 includes elements similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 39 and is believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

The remaining claims depend from one of the dependent claims discussed above and are believed to be allowable, at least for the reasons started above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 6, 2007

/Irvin E. Branch/

Irvin E. Branch
Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
IEB/jln
61112292 v1